

Polit. Pamph. vol 132.

THE
TRUE INTENTION
OF
DR. MUSGRAVE'S
ADDRESS
TO THE
FREEHOLDERS OF DEVONSHIRE.

Omnis expers curæ, quæ scribentis animum, et si non
flectere a vero, sollicitum tamen efficere, possit.

TIT. LIV.

Oh Malagrida! Malagrida oh!

L O N D O N,

Printed for ROBINSON and ROBERTS, at No. 25,
in Paternoster-row; and M. HINGESTON,
near Temple-Bar.

MDCCLXIX.

TRIPLE INTENTION



Parliament of Great Britain

Ordered by the House of Commons, in pursuance of a Resolution, passed on the 14th day of May, 1801, that the following should be printed and bound in one volume, to be sold by the Stationers and Booksellers in London, at the price of one shilling and sixpence per copy.

By the Stationers and Booksellers in London.

L O N D O N

Printed for R. B. Johnson and J. G. Johnson, at the Stationers and Booksellers in London, at the price of one shilling and sixpence per copy.

March 1801

**T H E
T R U E I N T E N T I O N**

O F

**Dr. MUSGRAVE'S
A D D R E S S S.**

THE welfare of a nation, the lives and treasure of her subjects, the honors and the triumphs of her fleets and armies, are things so sacred and inestimable, that whoever may presume to traffic in such commodities, and betray their country to the enemies thereof, are not only unpardonable, but no punishment, however great, can be adequate to the crimes they have committed, nor to the infliction which they deserve. Before these important considerations, all rank, title, and property ought to disappear; or rather, as all these are proportionably great in the offenders, they become more inexcusable.

B

Temp-

Temptation which must plead in vain the cause of poverty, can offer no palliative for such men, and on such occasions.

On the other hand, as the selling of a nation's honor and acquirements is the most enormous crime of which a human being can be accused, the most destructive of his fame, and the most dangerous to his life; such an accusation, if altogether groundless or insupportable by the accuser, is that offence which is only next in degree of criminality to the bartering a nation's greatness and felicity for private and pecuniary interest.

From the Address of Dr. Musgrave to the Freeholders of Devon, it appears that either there are persons of exalted rank, who have been guilty of this heinous crime, or that he, and probably some others also in concert with him, are guilty of an indefensible accusation. Who of these are the criminal, and who the innocent, is an enquiry of the greatest moment to the state, and to those who are asserted to be concerned in this transaction. Two peers and privy-counsellors are mentioned as guilty of this crime; and it is farther said, " That
" the supreme government of the king-
" dom,

“ dom, may, by the regency act, devolve
 “ to a person directly and positively accused
 “ of high treason.” Tho’ the names of these
 persons are not inserted in the Address, they
 are in the information given to Lord Ha-
 lifax; and if they were not, there can be
 no doubt who are intended by the description
 of them. This act therefore of Dr. Musgrave
 is highly deserving the public and national
 thanks of his countrymen, if the history
 he relates be true; but if otherwise, what-
 ever may be the letter of the law, whether
 all punishment be evaded by this conceal-
 ment of their names in the Address, or ne-
 vertheless incurred by their delineations,
 and actual naming in the information, no
 abhorrence of such a man can be equal to
 the detestation he deserves; and this he
 must certainly receive. With a view impar-
 tially and dispassionately to enquire into
 the circumstances of this accusation, and
 thence deduce a fair and candid inference,
 I will examine the progress and particulars
 of this transaction, as they are related in
 the Address, and as they are to be found
 in the letter of Mons. D’Eon, and some
 other papers; from thence it may result,
 either that the guilty will be more expedi-

tiously brought to judgment, or the innocent more speedily absolved from all criminal imputation. If either of these ends be obtained, I shall have discharged the duty of a good subject; and I am no farther solicitous concerning this affair.

Dr. Musgrave declares that the important secret was disclosed to him in the year 1764, during his residence at Paris. “ That
 “ on the 12th of May 1765, by the direction of Dr. Blackstone, he waited on Lord
 “ Halifax then secretary of state, and delivered to him an exact narrative of the
 “ intelligence he had received at Paris,
 “ with copies of four letters to and from
 “ Lord Hertford. Lord Halifax objected
 “ to all public steps which might give an
 “ alarm, and asked the Dr. whether he
 “ could point out to him any way of prosecuting the enquiry in secret, and whether in so doing there was a probability
 “ of his obtaining positive proof of the fact.
 “ Four days after, the Dr. gave a direct and
 “ satisfactory answer to both these questions. Lord Halifax then put an end to
 “ Dr. Musgrave’s solicitations, by a peremptory refusal to take any steps whatever in the affair.”

Whether

Whether the direct and satisfactory answer, which the Dr. gave, was, that he could point out a secret way of prosecuting the enquiry, and a probability of Lord Halifax's obtaining a positive proof of the fact; or whether he could do neither of them, is not declared in this account. An answer may be as direct and as satisfactory in the negative, as in the affirmative; and from what Dr. Musgrave hath said, in another part of his Address, and from the conduct of Lord Halifax on this discovery, I am apt to think, that the negative was the direct and satisfactory answer. Otherwise Dr. Musgrave seems to contradict himself. If he gave a direct and satisfactory answer to the probability of obtaining a positive proof of the fact, why does he say that "it must not be understood, that he himself can support a charge of corruption against the noble Lords named in the information;" what then is to be understood from it? That Dr. Musgrave hath dared to fix this guilt, on those noblemen without proof, and thence derive on them all that mischief which ought to follow on such misconduct. If he cannot prove them culpable, though he did not believe

lieve them innocent, he ought at least to have abstained from accusation; and as at that time, as it appears by the sequel, that Mr. D'Eon was the person on whom he relied, I am apt to think, that Lord Halifax did give a peremptory refusal, because Dr. Musgrave could give no satisfactory answer that there was a positive proof. If Dr. Musgrave affirmed that the probability of the discovery lay in himself, he said to Lord Halifax, what he now contradicts to the public; and as to the support which he was to receive from the chevalier D'Eon, that is now annihilated, the Chevalier having denied all that Dr. Musgrave hath asserted, respecting him.

Dr. Musgrave then, as he declares, he is not able to support the charge of corruption against those noble Lords named in this information, must now support a lawful enquiry into the motives which could induce him to accuse men, whom he cannot prove to be guilty. To this he cannot on his own principles, object; for if these Lords and that other person on whom the regency may devolve, are to have their conduct examined into, on the insupportable charge of this gentleman, surely the
Dr,

Dr. can offer no reasonable objection against his own conduct being enquired into, respecting this charge of corruption, tho' he cannot support it.

This direct denial of the Chevalier D'Eon, howsoever discordant it may at first appear, is not improbably the very thing which Dr. Musgrave, and his associates, desire and intend. And I flatter myself that I shall place this circumstance in so clear a light, that it will effectually prove that this method is the only one which could have been adopted with a probability of success, by the enemies of that person on whom the regency may devolve, and the two Peers named in the information. But before I proceed to that particular, I must examine the circumstances of the preceding account. During the four days interval between the presenting Lord Halifax with the information, and the receiving the peremptory refusal; does Dr. Musgrave, or any man of common intellects imagine, that this information was not laid before Mr. Grenville, who was then first Lord of the Treasury, and probably before the Cabinet Council? Was not the result of this council, either that
the

the affair had no foundation; or that, for other reasons, it ought not to be enquired into? That it had no foundation was the result, is evident; otherwise, would those ministers have remained in administration, with one of those Peers, who is supposed to be designed in the Address? or with the secret of such a sale as the Dr. relates, would they have been dismissed, because Mr. Stuart Mackenzie, the brother of Lord Bute, was removed from office; or, indeed on any other account whatever, had such a secret been concealed in their bosoms? Can any reasonable man believe that a certain Peer, with his life, honour, and fortune in their hands, would have dared to risque them all in a manner so incentive to men, who have not born dismissal with much patience, nor manifested much gratitude for past favours from their Sovereign? If these men were then persuaded of the truth of this information, why did they delay doing justice to their country, by pursuing the betrayers of it? if they at present resume, what they then rejected, what opinion can be entertained of their integrity? Will it not be deemed revenge, or lust of power, rather than the love of justice, and
their

their country? For should this accusation be proved to be true, how shall we divide the infamy and iniquity of the concealment of that crime, from the actually committing it? To these queries it may be answered, that there are at present other proofs than they then were informed of, and that this is the reason of their present pursuits. That there are no fuller evidence now than then, is not pretended. The Lords and Gentlemen of that administration cannot have taken up that information at present, which they formerly rejected. Notwithstanding this circumstance, I am convinced that those who have engendered this Address, do assuredly expect to derive therefrom the fullest effect, which the strongest demonstrations can impart to a credulous people; and this shall be explained.

These gentlemen, will not with Dr. Musgrave declare, “that they have waited, “tho’ with reluctance and impatience, till “a proper opportunity should offer for “appealing to the public at large; that is, “till the accumulated errors of government should awaken a spirit of enquiry “too powerful to be resisted or eluded.”

Should this be their plea for their stifling the Doctor's information and enquiry, they have added, to the crime of concealment, the guilt of contributing to the accumulation of those evils. Because by the proving this charge of corruption, other ministers, even they themselves, might have been in power; and they will certainly not declare that their administration would have proved otherwise than laudable. Besides this, at what time was the spirit of enquiry insufficient to the supporting a charge against those Peers and the other personage, had there existed a true ground of accusation? Do these Gentlemen and the Doctor therefore rely on the present spirit of tumult and sedition, as too powerful to be resisted or eluded? This may indeed be policy, but it cannot be justice. It will soon be seen whether the truth is to be overborn or supported by popular commotion, and whether this accusation be resisted or eluded, or the assertion totally disproved, respecting these Peers, and that personage of the regency. And into that subject I am now farther to enquire. I shall first observe, that if Secretaries of State are to enter upon the public enquiry of all those whom Dr. Musgrave,

grave, and men like him, are pleased to accuse, and not exert their judgments to refuse compliance, equally with those who urge impeachment, that nothing can be more unjust. The Doctor says, “but I will suppose, for argument sake, the persons accused to be perfectly innocent: is it not the interest, and the wish of every innocent man, to have his conduct scrutinized while facts are recent, and must of consequence be easy to be distinguished from falsehood?” Does Dr. Musgrave imagine that innocent men are to have their conduct examined into on his single accusation? or that any man, however innocent, can wish to undergo that scrutiny? I must tell that gentleman, that I know but of one more disagreeable thing to innocence, than being arraigned, tried, and found *guiltless*; and that is, being found *guilty*. And since that cannot be effected, Dr. Musgrave has laboured to fix that condemnation on those persons whom he accuses, unable, as he says, to prove them guilty: for such is the malevolent practice of the world, that a great man brought to answer to such accusations, however innocent he may be proved, is

never more so perfectly restored to fame as he was before he was suspected; to say nothing of that trouble and expence which this must be to him. Until better reasons are offered than Dr. Musgrave hath hitherto brought to light, Lord Halifax must be exculpated from all misbehaviour on this account. And indeed Dr. Musgrave has, in another place, declared, " I have been
 " thus particular in enumerating the evils
 " that may result from the refusal of Lord
 " Halifax, not from a desire of aggra-
 " vating that nobleman's offence, but
 " merely to evince the necessity of a speedy
 " enquiry, while there is yet a chance of
 " its not being altogether fruitless." Surely the Peer and the physician are not better friends at this time than formerly? The Nobleman cannot have given the Doctor permission to use his name in that manner, because without that use he could make no discovery of his transaction. I have known men voluntarily involve themselves in some degree of criminality, in order absolutely to overwhelm those whom they hated, particularly when the fate of the others would expiate the guilt of both, and leave the former even in some degree of credit with

with the multitude. But of this affair we shall receive more perfect intelligence, when it is seen what will be the result of this address to the Devonians.

Dr. Musgrave to the preceding paragraph subjoins, “In the summer of the
 “ year 1764 an overture had been made
 “ to Sir George Yonge, Mr. Fitzherbert,
 “ and several other members of parlia-
 “ ment, in the name of the Chevalier
 “ D'Eon, importing, that he, the Che-
 “ valier, was ready to impeach three per-
 “ sons, two of whom were Peers, and
 “ members of the privy-council, of selling
 “ the peace to the French. Of this pro-
 “ posal Dr. Musgrave was informed, at
 “ different times, by the two gentlemen
 “ above mentioned; Sir George Yonge
 “ in particular told him, that he under-
 “ stood the charge could be supported by
 “ written, as well as living evidence. The
 “ step that he urged Lord Halifax to take,
 “ was to send for the Chevalier D'Eon, to
 “ examine him upon the subject of that
 “ overture, to peruse his papers, and then
 “ to proceed according to his proofs; in
 “ such a case a more decisive evidence than
 “ the Chevalier D'Eon could not be wished
 “ for ;

“ for, he had the negotiation on the part
 “ of the enemy, and was known to have
 “ in his possession the dispatches and pa-
 “ pers of the Duke de Nevernois. This
 “ gentleman, so qualified, and so disposed
 “ to give light into the affair, did Lord
 “ Halifax refuse to examine. Whether
 “ from an apprehension that the charge
 “ could not be made out, or on the con-
 “ trary, that it could, I leave you, gentle-
 “ tlemen, and every impartial reader, to
 “ judge.”

In the first place, none of these members
 of parliament are mentioned by name, ex-
 cept Sir George Yonge and Mr. Fitzher-
 bert, who were then in opposition, and are
 now in office. The reasons for the pub-
 lishing their names, and omitting the
 others, are suggested in a letter to Dr.
 Musgrave, printed in the Gazetteer, and
 to which, if Dr. Musgrave does not give a
 direct and satisfactory answer, it must be
 concluded, that he has given the names
 above-mentioned to the public, because he
 expects no promotion of his enquiry from
 them, and that he has secreted the others,
 because he expects their assistance; the pub-
 lic odium is therefore to be drawn down
 on

on the former, and the others are to be screened from it, by not being known; but in this design he will certainly miscarry. The Chevalier D'Eon has disowned the knowing of those Gentlemen; this intelligence of Dr. Musgrave, then is founded on a relation of one other relation, at least, from Mons. D'Eon to some other person: But, alas, this assertion is already contradicted, and such a contradiction was designed, and known that it would be made also.

As Sir George Yonge and Mr. Fitzherbert were then in opposition, can it be credited, that this overture of Mons. D'Eon, was not communicated to the Marquis of Rockingham, and the Gentlemen who were then engaged with him in that opposition? Had there been any just grounds on which to found the accusation, of selling the peace to the French, would these Lords and Gentlemen have abstained from prosecuting the enquiry, not only against the persons accused of selling, but even against Lord Halifax, who had given so peremptory a refusal. The character of Lord Rockingham is sufficient to disprove the account of Mons. D'Eon's having such means of discovery; he would not have remained

mained inactive on an affair of so much moment to his country, nor would that nobleman and his friends have retired from office, in perfect silence on that subject; nor would they have been dismissed, had that secret been in their keeping.

If Lord ——— was instrumental in the dismissal of the Grenville and the Rockingham administration, would he have engaged in that affair? Had he not been conscious of his innocence, would he so repeatedly have risked the chance of discovery, and the resentment of two successive ministries, were there existing the least possible means of proving him guilty? Is it not something more than papal credulity to believe it?

As to the papers and dispatches of the Duke de Nivernois being in the hands of D'Eon, particularly those in relation to so dangerous a negotiation, as selling a national peace; can it be believed that such a transaction would have been done in England, when it might be accomplished at Versailles; or that any man, who would dare so criminal an act, would suffer the proofs of it to pass into the hands of a French minister in this kingdom, when

he himself was present in France, to negotiate his own affairs, and thereby intrust his life, honour, and estate to his enemy? Mons. D'Eon, therefore, whatsoever dispatches he may possess, can have none in relation to that affair, even had it been transacted. And if Dr. Musgrave believed he had, tho' he may be deemed a zealous subject, he is evidently a too credulous man. It is repeated on very good grounds, that Sir George Saville did, in consequence of the above overture of Mr. D'Eon, wait on Mr. Pitt, in relation to that subject; and that, in the conversation which they had together, Mr. Pitt declared, that the whole story was absolutely a falsehood: In consequence of this declaration, the relation was deemed to be groundless, and all farther enquiry relinquished.

The countenance which Lord Temple has given to Mons. D'Eon, and the intimacy which hath subsisted between them, make it extremely credible, if D'Eon has such papers, that the noble Lord must be acquainted with them; and if they contain such proofs of veracity as Dr. Musgrave asserts, that the Earl would not have so long refrained from entering on the en-

D

quary

quiry which the Doctor urges. It must therefore be either false that D'Eon has such papers, or the noble Earl must stand accused of concealing the malversation of the two Peers, and that personage on whom the regency may devolve: which of these is the most probable, I shall, like Dr. Musgrave, leave to the judgment of every impartial reader, after he has weighed the circumstances of the time, and the character of that nobleman. Thro' the Doctor's address as well as Mr. D'Eon's letter, there runs an affectation of not knowing each other. The Doctor represents the intelligence, which Mons. D'Eon would impart, as coming to him from Sir George Yonge; and Mons. D'Eon says, in the beginning of his letter, that the Doctor never knew any more of him, than he has the honor of knowing of the Doctor; and this may be literally true, and yet both of them know each other extremely well. Whatever may be their acquaintance, there are very strong reasons for their not appearing to act in concert, as the affair is now conducted. Can it be conceived, however, that Dr. Musgrave, after being informed that Mr. D'Eon was engaged in the same

cause, did not visit the Frenchman, in order to be ascertained of the truth or falsehood which had been related to him by the two members of parliament; or, that Dr. Musgrave would so freely have advised Lord Halifax to send for Mr. D'Eon, to examine him on that overture, and peruse his papers, had he not been previously authorised by that foreigner to proceed in that manner? The contrary would have been a very indiscrete and precipitate behaviour.

The reason of their declining the knowledge of each other, is not difficult to be assigned; the contradiction which Mons. D'Eon hath given to the address of Dr. Musgrave, would not have had the effect which is intended from it, and which is totally different from that of exculpating the Peers, and the other person mentioned in the Address; and had an intimacy been supposed to subsist between them, they would have then been deemed to act in concert. This truth I am now going to explain.

From the circumstances already related, and the conduct of those persons who must be supposed to know them, it must ap-

pear, that the evidence which D'Eon might
 pretend to give, had no foundation for the
 accusing of those persons whose names the
 Doctor has inserted in his information;
 nothing therefore could be grounded on
 those papers, whatever they may otherwise
 contain, and therefore nothing by those
 means was to be directly attempted against
 them: but the impossibility of accomplish-
 ing a mischief by one method, does by no
 means preclude the hopes, or restrain the
 attempts of atchieving it by another. The
 intelligence therefore which those papers
 contained, and which can bring no evi-
 dence of guilt against the Peers, and other
 personage accused, was now to be convert-
 ed to their ruin, by the pretension of its
 being concealed. Is it therefore altogether
 improbable, that Dr. Musgrave hath with
 this view asserted, that "about the 17th
 "of May 1765, Mr. Fitzherbert told him,
 "he knew that overtures had been made
 "to Mons. D'Eon, to sell, for a sum of
 "money, the papers that were in his
 "hands, in order to its being disavowed,
 "and thus prepare the people to his pur-
 "pose." From this whole account Dr.
 Musgrave appears either as a zealous, a
 weak,

weak, or a wicked member of society. The first creates credulity, the second has no power of refutation, the last engenders malice; and mischief is either the incidental or intended progeny of them all: and thus revenge, ambition, the lust of power and of riches, are to be satisfied at all adventures, and by every means in the malice of those who have encouraged him.

It was expedient that Dr. Musgrave should be induced to publish a narrative of his conduct, in the manner of an Address to the Freeholders of Devon, and the whole nation; he was to pronounce an authentic testimony of what he delivered, to be residing in the hands of Mons. D'Eon; and in order to impart a credibility to this account, he was to awaken the passions and credulity of the people, by describing the sanguinary attempts to assassinate and kidnap Mons. D'Eon; and to embroider the story with a flourish, on a proposal of an offer to purchase his papers. The gaping multitude were already inflamed, by misrepresentation and calumny: In this state of agitation, the most incredible accounts are the most readily believed; all others are unequal to the ardency and turbulence of
their

their expectations: It was on this account concluded, that the populace would certainly entertain this relation as a truth, and absolutely believe that Mons. D'Eon did once possess those important secrets, and the power of revealing them; but, that now they are sold, and that therefore he denies he ever held such proofs.

Notwithstanding the direct contradiction, in Mr. D'Eon's letter, to the fact asserted in the address, it is most undoubtedly true, that he has frequently reported, that he had such secrets in his power; and, strange as it may appear, the proofs of his having thus represented things, being capable of being brought against his written testimony, is the very reason of its being denied in his letter.

The populace, and too many among other men, listen not to the dictates of reason, if they are capable of understanding them; they are influenced by their emotions and desires, and what they wish to be, is constantly received as actually existing: On this account, tho' no credit should ever be given to any man who utters contradictory relations, yet they universally disbelieve that part of them which opposes

opposes their views and wishes, however credible; and believe those alone which coincide with them; and on this uniform effect it was depended in the conduct of this transaction.

It would have been a most notorious act of self-contradiction, for Mr. D'Eon to have owned in his letter, what he had before denied. He himself had twice disavowed, in two former publications, the having such evidence. Written evidence would have been opposed to written evidence; the writer would have been confronted by himself, and no degree of veracity could have been communicated to his third publication, had it contradicted the two preceding. Oral tradition, was therefore to be opposed against that which he had already published, and was to repeat; and what he has undoubtedly declared in words, was to be offered as a refutation of what he has written; and this disavowal in his publications, was to be considered as the effect of corrupt and pecuniary influence in the accused. By this master-piece of policy, the very facts, which the papers cannot prove, are intended to be realized into active existence. Their being denied
in

in the printed publications, and the prevalent propensity in the multitude, to embrace all relations so circumstanced, as irrefragable truths, are the supports on which they depend for success. By this contrivance the full effects of a perfect revelation are to be derived from the impossibility of their being disclosed; and at the same time the practicability of coming to the proofs of what is asserted in those pretended dispatches, is to be evaded without suspicion of malevolence or mischief. By this unpardonable artifice, the odium of selling the peace, and betraying their country, is to fall on the Peers, and that other personage on whom the regency may devolve; and the contrivers of this machination, imagine they have secured themselves from being detected in their intentions, or foiled in their pursuit; and that they are enabled to effectuate that full mischief, without applying to the papers of Mons. D'Eon, which they know they could never have accomplished, by their being exposed to the world, or to a court of judicature; and this impracticability of coming to the papers of Mons. D'Eon, is at once to create the belief, that these precious documents contain

tain the means of conviction, and to excuse themselves from ever attempting to impeach the persons whom they have accused, because the evidence is either sold or secreted. Hence it appears, that the self-contradiction between his publications and his reports, are perfectly coincident; and that without this conduct, no impression could have been made on the minds of the people, no accusation believed, nor mischief executed against the persons described; is it not therefore expedient, that the Dr. and the Foreigner, should appear to be unknown to each other? The truth is, that Mr. D'Eon hath no such papers; and therefore, if he declared he had, that such not being to be exhibited, the whole ground of accusation must instantly disappear; and therefore the declarations which he hath spoken, are to be contrasted with what he hath published, and the mischief of a real evidence is to arise from this contradiction, which can by no other human means be perpetrated, and is altogether groundless and insupportable.

That Mons. D'Eon hath at no time received a single shilling from the ministry, nor from the persons whom Musgrave ac-

E

cuses,

cuses, I am certain. That he hath received presents from the friends of Wilkes, I am as credibly informed as man can well be; that he has frequently dined with him, and did so a very few days before the publication of Dr. Musgrave's address, is well known; that he declared to several gentlemen, the day before his letter appeared, that he had received expresses from all the persons accused, I have heard from one of those gentlemen to whom he said it. Would Monf. D'Eon have said, what I do not believe, that he had received such messages, even if they had been sent, unless his intention was to refute by words, the declaration he has made in writing? Thus by declaring openly, that he has received such correspondence, does he not insinuate that he still has, or once had, such proofs in his possession? and by these means offer vile and fallacious evidence to the people, because he is absolutely unable to produce another? The horror of such attempts is too terrible and stupendous to be described, it wants neither declamation nor argument to speak home to the heart. All who hear must feel the deadly influence, and execrate the perpetrators.

In

In this nefarious design, whether Dr. Musgrave be conscious of the true intent, or duped by impetuous zeal, I will not attempt to determine. He hath presumed, however, to brand the Mother of his King, with the stigma of high treason, himself confessedly unable to support the charge. This is the most audacious act that hath hitherto been attempted, in this realm, and this effrontery even imparts some credit to his narration ; for the undiscerning multitude conceive, that no man without a demonstrative evidence in his possession, could have dared so atrocious a deed. It is unprecedented in history, but by those infamous sons of rebellion, who, in the year 1643, impeached the queen of high treason, for assisting her husband and her sovereign with arms and ammunition. Can it be conceived that a Parent would sell the honour and the dignity of her Son, the lives and treasure of his subjects, the conquests of his arms, the welfare of the kingdom, her own fame, safety, and estimation, and expose herself to infamy and death, for any sum which can be given by any nation? Execrable must be the bosom which can harbour such sentiments, and detestable

the men who have thus accused her. To her he hath adjoined two Peers, who he declares also have sold a peace to France; and these unparalleled assertions he has dared to publish, tho' he himself declares, "that it must not be understood, that he can himself support a charge of corruption against the noble Lords named in his information." Heaven defend the innocent, and even the guilty, from the blood-thirsty pursuits of this sanguinary physician!

Who are his springs of action and his first movers, I will not presume to suggest; the horror of the deed will not permit me to impute it to a Briton, without a demonstration in my hands, of those who dared it. I will not imitate Dr. Musgrave, nor even accuse the meanest persons of such crimes, and declare that it must be understood, that I cannot myself support the charge. Deep daring and envenomed as this nefarious attempt must appear, to every man whose bosom both conscience and humanity have not deserted, and of which, both malice and destruction have not taken possession, the whole design would have been incomplete, could the proofs even of the

the preceding accusation have been accomplished. There can be no real design, whatever may be the inclination, to attempt the finding those persons guilty, whom Musgrave hath accused. For tho' men may be arraigned for treason, they cannot be condemned without evidence, and as of such evidence they have no trace, they will not expose themselves to detestation, by manifesting their villainous intentions to ruin others. As a plea for the not prosecuting those persons accused, Mr. D'Eon was to declare, "that Dr. Musgrave's interest, Mr. D'Eon's honor and truth, oblige him to deny all what the Dr. has advanced thereon with respect to him." By this conduct all the malevolence of accusation, and the effects of guilt were to be transfused thro' the people, and those who had committed that unexampled iniquity, were to plead the impossibility of succeeding in an impeachment, because Mr. D'Eon had denied his being in possession of such proofs as have been declared to be in his hands; and therefore they were to be excused from attempting it. By these means the mischief was to be effected, and the legal pursuit omitted. To excite the tumultuous mul-

multitude to clamour and sedition, or perhaps to assassinate the persons named in the information, and signified in the Address, may be no improbable surmise. To remove them from all trust and confidence with their sovereign, is certainly their intention; and to obtain the dismissal of the present ministry, and assume their places, is too probable a motive to create a doubt: if such men be admitted near the throne, God defend the king and his people!

But as the Duke of Grafton, who is now first Lord of the Treasury, cannot possibly have had any connection with, nor participation in the heinous act, which is so unjustly imputed to the persons in the information and Address, there can be no ground on which to charge him on that account: and consequently no room to attempt his removal. But as without his dismissal nothing essential to the undertaking of the antecedent purpose can be perpetrated: some method was to be devised in order to link him, with the foregoing persons in criminality, and involve them all in the same ruin. With this view, his Grace was to be made an accomplice, if not a principal in this transaction, and to be criminated
with

with attempting to conceal what he could not have been concerned in transacting. On this account it was inserted in the public papers, that he dined on a certain day with Lord Temple, at Stowe; and this intelligence was intended to be preparatory to that which follows, in the Gazetteer, Sept. 6th, that “ Lord Bute, and the Duke of Grafton, both knew the contents of “ Dr. Musgrave’s letter, many weeks before it made its appearance, and they “ had concerted many schemes to suppress its publication, but all these schemes, “ however artfully managed, proved abortive. Accordingly the Duke of Grafton, “ immediately was to wait in person on “ Lord Temple; ***** pretended to know “ the very bait which would tempt his “ Lordship, it was nothing less than a “ Dukedom, and if he ***** was to make “ the offer, Lord Temple, he said, might “ doubt the performance. By this device “ and advice of ***** B— and his toad eater were easily betrayed into a fond belief of gaining over Lord Temple to their “ faction; accordingly the Duke of Grafton “ posted down to Stowe, and this truly, “ courtly visit, was immediately announced “ in

“ in every news-paper, throughout the
 “ kingdom; the success of this visit is no
 “ longer a mystery; the wild, incoherent,
 “ crude plan of operations, were conveyed
 “ without loss of time to Fonthill;” and
 from thence, by the means of him, who
 resembles his grandfather’s drum, noisy,
 empty, and sounding to rebellion, “ they
 “ soon arrived at Plymouth. Dr. Musgrave
 “ thought this a glorious opportunity to
 “ crush the whole junto, by hanging them
 “ out to public view, and public odium;
 “ with this view, and to do justice to a
 “ brave but greatly injured people, the Dr.
 “ with a courage not to be daunted, pub-
 “ lished that well-timed letter, which has
 “ thereby opened the eyes of every subject
 “ in the kingdom.”

The very manner in which this story is
 related, discovers the falsehood: who but
 a person present at the concerting this
 scheme, can relate the circumstances of it?
 But it wants no other refutation than this
 positive declaration, that the Duke of
 Grafton did not dine at Stowe, nor offer
 Lord Temple a Dukedom. Who these
 persons were that inserted this falsehood in
 the news-papers, and to what intent it was
 done, can certainly be no mystery at present.

This story, tho' an untruth in the preceding instance, reveals too much if it be true in the rest; but I will not believe that Lord Temple can engage in such a criminal pursuit.

Such is the history of this most atrocious and insidious procedure; but the inventors will find themselves deceived, for instead of creating the persuasion they desire; it will shew the world the dispositions and designs of these accursed perpetrators. It will exculpate the persons accused, and be productive of one universal detestation of the accuser, and his accomplices; it will, if common sense and common honesty have not deserted the breasts of Britons, establish the contrary of what it is intended to effect; it will, or ought to give peace to the King and his people, who have been so long alarmed and disquieted by the seditious darings, and cruel pursuits of men, whose souls are bent on perpetrating the most enormous villainies to acquire power.

Such then was to be the conduct of this black design. Doctor Musgrave and the Chevalier D'Eon were to appear to be unknown to each other, to avoid the suspicion of acting in concert. The physician was, there-

F fore,

fore, in his address to receive his intelligence of what the papers of the Frenchman contained, from other persons than this foreigner; and the latter was to give an equivocal answer respecting his knowledge of Musgrave, which was to be taken as a denial of acquaintance. The Doctor was to assert, that D'Eon had told Sir George Yonge and Mr. Fitzherbert, that he was ready to impeach three persons, two of whom are Peers and members of the privy-council, the other that personage on whom the government of the kingdom may, by the regency act, devolve, of selling the peace.—That the Chevalier had the negotiations on the part of the enemy, and was known to have in his possession the dispatches and papers of the Duke de Nivernois.—That a more decisive evidence than the Chevalier D'Eon would not be wished for.—That overtures had been made to him for selling the papers that were in his hands.—And that Lord Halifax had put an end to Musgrave's solicitations, by a peremptory refusal to take any steps whatever in the affair.

The falsehood of the above assertions were well known to those who had interested

ested themselves in the enquiry, soon after the Doctor had given his information to the Secretary of State, and the project was relinquished as utterly indefensible; but now, at the distance of four years, it is resumed, and laid upon another ground, as it has been antecedently related.

In pursuit of this purpose, D'Eon, who had already twice contradicted in the public papers the above relations, and had frequently declared the contrary in conversation, was still to persist in the same contradictions in writing, and insinuate an opposite opinion in discourse. With this intent he has said in his letter, that “ he “ is inspired with sentiments of the justest “ veneration for the English commission- “ ers who had been employed in the peace; “ and that England rather gave money to “ France, than France to England, to “ conclude that peace.” Notwithstanding this, on the morning before the publication of his letter, he asserted, that he had received three expresses from three great persons; and that he knew neither Sir George Yonge, nor Mr. Fitzherbert.

In consequence of this written declaration it was to be promulged, that D'Eon

had frequently related what Musgrave asserts, and that he was unacquainted with Mr. Fitzherbert; which was to be disproved. By these means a total disbelief was to be spread over all the Chevalier hath written or may write, and an implicit faith imparted to all that he has related; and thus the people are to be persuaded that D'Eon had either purposely concealed, or sold his papers to the persons accused; and that Musgrave's whole narrative was unspotted truth.

This absolute ignorance of each other was to create the persuasion, that Musgrave was totally unacquainted with that which would be the answer of D'Eon; otherwise the former must incur the imputation of rashness or iniquity in publishing his Address, and accusing those against whom he declares he is unable to support a charge of corruption. By these means the task of proving his assertions is shifted on D'Eon; and D'Eon, by denying them to be true, is to be supposed a man corrupted: thus Musgrave, deserted by D'Eon, is to be exculpated in not proving what he declares, and the people to proclaim him a patriot, and admire his resolution in defence of his country.

By

By these means the curse of high treason was to descend on the Mother of his Majesty, and two Peers of the realm, who are absolutely unconscious of the imputed crime; and the evidence, which was to establish the belief of their guiltiness, was to be engendered from the impossibility of its being proved : infernal machination !

Recrimination is not my object—otherwise----but I shall say no more.----I will not be guilty of those acts which I condemn in others---Let the stricken deer go weep.

F I N I S:

